

REMARKS

Claim 50 is being amended to correct a mistake in the recitation of the location of the power-up signal generation circuit. Figure 5 (referring to the informal drawings filed with the application) illustrates the combination of claim 50, which is described in the last full paragraph of page 9 of the specification. Signal detection circuitry 64 is integrated with the signal processor 72. Battery power is supplied to the signal detection circuitry when the communications device is in a stand-by mode but not to the rest of the signal processor with which the power-up circuit is integrated. Power is connected with the rest of the signal processor only when an infrared signal is received that causes the signal detection circuitry to generate a power-up signal. Providing power to the signal detection circuitry 64 separate from the rest of the signal processor 72 with which it is integrated is a novel feature of claim 50. One of the cited references describes a separate circuit within communications devices that are powered to detect a wake-up signal but do not suggest the claimed combination where such a circuit is integrated with the a processor.

Cited U.S. patent no. 5,115,236 ("Kohler") uses a detection circuit 6 that is separate from other components, including the signal processor 1 and controller 4. It is a power-up signal from the circuit 6 that turns on power to other separate components including the signal processor 1 and the controller 4. This is quite different from the combination of claim 50 that would integrate the power detection circuit 6 with the signal processor 1 but yet apply power only to the detection circuit part of the integrated circuit when the system is in the stand-by mode. Claim 50 further recites that, once receipt of an infrared signal is detected, power is then applied to the remaining signal processor portion of the integrated circuit.

The cited IRDA specification does not relate to the claimed integration of the signal detection circuit with a processor. Neither the IRDA standard discovery signal nor any other particular infrared signal is recited in claim 50.

The Office Action alleges that the cited EP application publication no. 772, 307 ("Selin") describes that "... a portion of the processor that recognizes the wake up signal . . must remain on to enable waking up of the device." (Office Action, p. 3, lns. 17-19) But no such disclosure has been found in Selin. In the portions specifically referenced in the

Office Action (col. 4, Ins. 45-55 and col. 9, Ins. 32+), the receiver is described to be switched on from time to time to look for wake-up signals but nothing has been found to suggest that a portion of a processor serves to detect incoming wake-up signals when in a stand-by mode, and particularly does not suggest that wake-up signal detection circuitry is integral with a processor. Selin's disclosure is at a much higher level without suggesting any such details of implementation.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a combination of Kohler, the IRDA specification and Selin is not well taken. Indeed, this combination does not make a *prima facie* case of obviousness since an element of the claim is still missing. There is no suggestion of integrating the wake-up signal detection circuitry with a processor such that the rest of the integrated circuit remains unpowered until the a signal is detected by the detection circuitry, as claimed.

The rejection of claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over newly cited U.S. patent no. 5,706,110 ("Nykanen") is also respectfully submitted to be improper. Nykanen appears to describe an infrared station (Figure 2) in logical terms and does include a power manager. But no suggestion has been found of a physical implementation where a signal detecting circuit is integrated with a processor and where the processor portion of the integrated circuit is powered down in a stand-by mode while the signal detecting circuit remains powered in order to detect receipt of a wake-up infrared signal. Indeed, no specific device hardware is described by Nykanen while claim 50 defines a physical device structure. Nykanen describes the operation of an infrared station at a logical level rather than describing a physical implementation.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the obviousness rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald P. Parsons
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 24,486
PARSONS HSUE & DE RUNTZ LLP
655 Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 318-1160
(415) 693-0194 fax

October 10, 2003
Date